DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 875 PS 018 939

AUTHOR Kunesh, Linda G.
TITLE Early Intervention for At-Risk Children in the North Central Region: A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION North Central Regional Educational Lab., Elmhurst, IL.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 90
CONTRACT 400-86-0004
NOTE 19p.
AVAILABLE FROM North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 295 Emroy Avenue, Elmhurst, IL 60126 (Order Number ECE-902, $2.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *At Risk Persons; Comparative Analysis; Early Childhood Education; *Early Intervention; *Educational Policy; Policy Formation; *Preschool Children; Program Evaluation; Regional Characteristics; *Standards; *State Government; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Illinois; Indiana; Iowa; Mandatory Programs; Michigan; Minnesota; Ohio; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

An executive summary of a study of early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central United States is provided. The SEAs selected for the study were located in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Policies developed before January, 1989 were studied. These included policies mandated by the seven SEAs or their state legislatures, and related rules, guidelines, and requirements. The study documented the processes by which the selected states developed their policies and legislation. Sections of the summary concern: (1) factors that support public investment in preschool programs; (2) development of the states' policies and legislation; (3) a comparative analysis of the states' early intervention policies, mandates, rules, guidelines, and requirements regarding components of effective early childhood programs as set out by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation and the National Association for the Education of Young Children; and (4) policy implications for educational quality, delivery and coordination of services, and accountability. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED321875

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION:

A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies

Executive Summary

By

Linda G. Kunesh

NCREL
NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

PS018939

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN IN THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION:

A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies

Executive Summary

By

Linda G. Kunesh

Published in 1990 by the:

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue, Elmhurst, IL 60126
(708) 941-7677.

Order Number: ECE-902; $2.50

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number 400-86-0004. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department of Education, or any other agency in the U.S. Government.

Preface

In 1988, the author undertook this policy study to fulfill the dissertation requirement for the degree of doctor of philosophy in educational leadership and policy studies at Loyola University Chicago. The primary purpose of the study was to identify and examine early intervention policies for young children at risk of academic failure in selected state education agencies (SEAs) in the North Central Region of the U.S. Since state legislatures have become very active in educational policymaking and have mandated early intervention or early childhood education (ECE) programs, the policies studied included those mandated by the seven SEAs and/or their corresponding state legislatures.

Legislation often requires state agencies to promulgate rules to amplify or clarify the law. Further, SEAs frequently develop guidelines and/or requirements for implementation of policies and legislation. Thus, rules, guidelines, and requirements were also examined in order to determine the current status of the policies and legislation.

The secondary purpose of the study was to document the processes by which the selected states developed their policies and legislation. This purpose grew out of requests made by some of the SEA personnel who were contacted for information about their state's policies. They indicated it would be helpful to them to know what kinds of studies and activities were undertaken prior to a state's development of policies or legislation. Thus, brief descriptions of the processes undertaken by states are provided where information was available.

The study was guided by the following question:

What state education agency policies and legislative mandates for early intervention/early childhood education programs for preschoolers at risk of academic failure were in place as of the 1988-89 school year?

Once the status of early intervention policies and legislation was determined in terms of accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements, they were analyzed in the following manner:

1. The policies, mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were compared with what the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation (High/Scope) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) say should be components of effective ECE programs.

2. An analysis was made of the actual policies, mandates, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements in terms of their implications for state and local decisionmakers.

The SEAs selected for the study were those in the states served by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL): **Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio,** and **Wisconsin**. Data for the study, that is copies of state legislation, policies of the departments of education, and accompanying rules, guidelines, and requirements were obtained from SEA personnel and legislators in the respective states. A list of individuals who supplied documents for review and analysis and who verified the accuracy of the descriptions in the full document is provided in the appendix.

The literature was surveyed to gain a historical perspective of the field of early intervention. In addition, national education and government organizations and associations were contacted by letter and telephone to obtain their position and/or policy statements on early intervention and ECE. Further, a number of research, policy, and advocacy organizations were also contacted for background information. A list of these organizations is also provided in the full document's appendix.

Based on the literature surveyed and the information collected, a historical review of early intervention was written and is available in a companion document by the same author through NCREL. The paper reviews pertinent educational movements and selected theorists and researchers who provided the bases for a rationale for early intervention.

High/Scope and NAEYC were also contacted because of their nationally recognized expertise in the education of young children. Information from these two organizations provided the components for early intervention and ECE programs against which SEA policies and legislative mandates were analyzed. This comparative analysis is presented in Chapter III. And finally, some of the major implications of the seven states' policies and legislation for early intervention are presented in Chapter IV.

A list of abbreviations, a glossary, and a comprehensive reference list are included with the full manuscript.

It is important that the reader keep in mind that the study examined only **state-initiated** policies and legislation pertaining to early intervention/early childhood education programs for young children at risk of academic failure. It did not comprehensively examine all programs that focus on young children at risk of academic failure, such as those sponsored and/or funded by federal legislation, such as, Head Start, Chapter I, bilingual, and provisions under PL 99-457, the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986. All of the states in the study participate in one or more of these federal programs. In addition, the study did not examine any of the privately sponsored programs for at-risk preschoolers, such as the Beethoven Project in Chicago.

Further, the policies, legislation, rules, guidelines, and requirements continue to develop in each state. The information that follows reflects the status of the states' initiatives that were developed prior to January, 1989.

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is extended to the following individuals who provided state documents for review:

Susan Andersen, Iowa Department of Education
Ann Bettenberg, Minnesota Department of Education
Linda Bond, Indiana Department of Education
Charles Bruner, Iowa State Senate
Sandra Crews, Illinois State Board of Education
Carol D'Amico, Indiana Department of Education
Lois Engstrom, Minnesota Department of Education
Nancy Floch, At-Risk Prekindergarten Program, Villa Park, IL
Susan Sullivan Fleig, Iowa Department of Education
Karen Goodenow, Iowa State Board of Education
Edith Helmich, Illinois State Board of Education
Dennis Jackson, Indiana Department of Education
Carolyn Logan, Michigan Department of Education
Harold MacDermot, Minnesota Department of Education
Kate McAuliffe, Michigan Department of Education
Corinna Moncada, Minnesota Department of Education
Chalmer Moore, Illinois State Board of Education
Joan Murray, Indiana Department of Education
Sally Pancrazio, Illinois State Board of Education
Carol Alexander Phillips, Iowa Department of Education
Mary Jo Richardson, Minnesota Department of Education
Thomas Stefonek, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Leland Tack, Iowa Department of Education
Margaret Trent, Ohio Department of Education
Dennis Van Den Heuvel, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Dorothy VanLooy, Michigan Department of Education
Jane Wiechel, Ohio Department of Education
Audrey Witzman, Illinois State Board of Education

Special thanks are also extended to the following individuals who provided helpful comments on previous drafts of the manuscript:

Arthur Dorman, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
Charles Edwards, University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Todd Fennimore, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
Carol Harding, Loyola University of Chicago
Judson Hixson, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
A. Baron Holmes, South Carolina Budget and Control Board
Marianne Kroeger, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
L. Arthur Safer, Loyola University Chicago
Lawrence Schweinhart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
Joan Smith, Loyola University Chicago
Patricia Smith, Valley View (IL) School District

Julie Casiello and Donna Wagner of the NCREL staff deserve special mention for their assistance in word processing and proofreading.

To my family and friends for their support and encouragement: THANKS!

And to "my kids" and their families who taught me what early intervention really means: Kiddos, there is hope for the flowers.

lgk

Introduction

Since A Nation At Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was released, a number of reforms have been recommended by many national organizations and groups to improve education in the U.S. Few, however, have received as much support as **Early Intervention** or **Early Childhood Education (ECE)** for young children who are at risk of academic failure. ECE generally provides developmentally appropriate activities and experiences for young children and opportunities for parents to become actively involved in the development and education of their children. In addition, health, nutrition, day-care, and social services are often provided.

Targeted to youngsters before they reach kindergarten, ECE is advocated by many diverse and influential groups as the major strategy to reduce or eliminate the risk of academic failure for large numbers of children (e.g., Committee for Economic Development, 1987; the National Governors' Association, 1986, 1987; the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1987, 1988; the National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988).

Factors Supporting Public Investment in Preschool Programs

Many factors have contributed to this diverse support for public investment in preschool programs. For example, children are now the poorest segment of the nation's population. In fact, they are seven times as likely to be poor as those over 65 years of age (Moynihan, 1986).

Children born in poverty often suffer from gross malnutrition, recurrent and untreated health problems, psychological and physical stress, child abuse, and learning disabilities. Those poor children who survive infancy are three times more likely to become school dropouts than are children from more economically advantaged homes. Frequently, they are children of children and live in single-parent homes (Committee for Economic Development, 1987).

The dramatic increase in the need for child-care arrangements also has contributed to a national focus on young children. During the mid-1980s, 50% of mothers with 1-year-olds had already returned to work (Hodgkinson, 1985). The Children's Defense Fund (1987) predicts that by 1995, two-thirds of all preschool children will have mothers in the work force.

By 1987, 24 states and the District of Columbia had spent state money on educational programs for preschool-aged children, and most states had targeted at-risk children for their programs (Grub, 1987; Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988). According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (Gnezda & Sonnier, 1988), the most significant factor influencing legislative support for ECE was research that demonstrated short- and long-term academic and social benefits to disadvantaged 3- and 4-year-olds who were enrolled in ECE programs.

Children enrolled in ECE programs:

- had higher academic performance,
- required less special education,
- had better school attendance and graduation rates,
- pursued more post-secondary education and training,
- had higher levels of employment and less unemployment, and
- had fewer contacts with the criminal justice system

(Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart, 1984; the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, 1978, 1981).

Barnett (1985) found that **for every $1 spent on ECE, $4 to $7 for later, more costly remedial and social programs was saved.**

The National Conference of State Legislatures (1989) also reported that state legislatures were considering initiating and expanding ECE programs as a major strategy to offset "the risks faced by disadvantaged children, putting them on the road to success at an early age" (p.6). There also appears to be strong public support for federal involvement in the care and education of young children. More than 100 child-care bills were introduced during the 100th Congress. Although none became law in 1988, nor again in 1989, it was speculated at the time of this printing that a compromise child-care bill will be reached by the House and Senate in 1990.

Development of States' Policies and Legislation

Illinois

Illinois' interest in ECE was formalized in 1983 when the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) directed its staff to conduct an Early Childhood Policy Study. In May of 1985, the State Board adopted an ECE policy statement and that summer, the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation authorizing ISBE to implement a grant program for public school districts to conduct preschool screening procedures and educational programs for 3- and 4-year-olds who were at risk of academic failure. Between FY 86 and FY 89, approximately $58.3 million was appropriated for the program.

Indiana

Funds were provided for preschool programs for at-risk children in Indiana as part of the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students which was legislated in 1987. Nine types of programs were listed in the law; however, school corporations (districts) were not limited to those programs. Of the 775 proposals for new or expanded at-risk programs approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the 1988-89 school year, 20 preschool programs received $542,839 in state funding, and local districts contributed $24,633. The 20 preschool programs served 2,108 at-risk youngsters and 2,281 non-at-risk children.

Iowa

In 1986, the Iowa State Board of Education created a Prekindergarten/Kindergarten Task Force to design a plan for establishing appropriate prekindergarten programs. The Task Force recommended guidelines for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten and kindergarten classes, as well as guidelines for a model for delivery of prekindergarten programs.

Then, in 1988, with strong support of the business community, the Iowa legislature passed the Child Development Assistance Act as part of welfare reform. This act created a Child Development Coordinating Council to promote the provision of child development services to at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds. The legislature also appropriated approximately $1.2 million for the Child Development Grants Program. Approximately one-third of the grants were awarded to school districts, one-third were awarded to Head Start projects, and one-third were awarded to day-care centers. Another piece of legislation in 1988 created the Center for Early Development Education which has since been established at the University of Northern Iowa.

Michigan

The Michigan State Board of Education approved "Standards of Quality and Curriculum Guidelines for Preschool Programs for Four-Year-Olds" in 1986 based on the work of a 22-member Early Childhood Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. Nine critical elements were included in the Standards: Philosophy; Population/Access; Curriculum; Learning Environment and Equipment; Advisory Council-Community Involvement; Parent/Family Involvement; Funding; Administrative/Supervisory Personnel; and Instructional Staff/Personnel. Since 1985, the Michigan Legislature appropriated $19.3 million for ECE programs for educationally disadvantaged 4-year-olds.

Minnesota

Minnesota has a 14-year history of providing services to young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, through the Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) program. In FY 88, the ECFE program had an $18.3 million budget, $7.6 million supported by state aid and $10.7 million provided by local tax levies. Delivered through Community Education, the program requires substantial parent involvement and utilizes statewide interagency cooperation.

In 1988, a $500,000 grant program was made available through legislation which provided opportunities for eligible recipients of the grants to develop programs for children, age 3 to kindergarten enrollment age, who are poor or significantly developmentally delayed.

Ohio

In 1983, the Ohio Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed an Early Childhood Task Force (later expanded to a Commission) to review different aspects of ECE. Services to preschool children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age, have been provided to Ohio children through adoption grants which were legislated in 1986 following the development of model programs for rural, suburban, and urban areas in 1985. The Ohio Department of Education has promulgated rules to accompany the provisions for the preschool programs under the Revised Code, and in 1986, began a four-year longitudinal study of preschool and kindergarten to produce information and data which may be helpful to policymakers.

By the 1988-89 school year, 70 counties had received incentive grants to initiate interagency coordination for projects serving young children and their families. Rules for the operation of preschool programs in public schools and eligible chartered nonpublic schools were developed and approved for adoption in 1988. Due to the passage of H.B. 67, school districts that are eligible for Disadvantaged Pupil Impact Aid have been allowed to use general revenue for those programs. A process was also established to study and formulate solutions for the at-risk population.

Wisconsin

In 1985, the Wisconsin legislature amended the Wisconsin School Code to re-establish the 4-year-old kindergarten (preschool) program which permitted school districts to provide kindergarten programs for 4-year-olds and to receive per pupil reimbursement based on class membership count in the state aid formula. Most of the 30 (of the 430) school districts that provided 4-year-old kindergarten programs during the 1988-89 school year served at-risk children.

The Wisconsin legislature also passed a bill in 1985 that targeted state resources to elementary schools in the Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Beloit school districts that have high concentrations of students from low-income families. Between 1985 and 1989, $6.19 million was appropriated to this program, known as the Preschool to Grade 5 or P-5 Program.

In 1987, the legislature passed a bill requiring the Milwaukee school board to contract with private, non-profit, non-sectarian day-care centers to provide ECE to 4- and 5-year-olds. And in 1988, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction amended requirements for teaching licenses and teacher preparatory programs in ECE leading to licensure in Wisconsin. These new requirements will go into effect in July, 1992.

Early Intervention: A Comparative Analysis

High/Scope and NAEYC recommend the following components for effective ECE programs:

- The use of developmentally appropriate curriculum and teaching practices based on theory, research, and practice;
- Staff and supervisors who are trained in early childhood education and child development and who receive ongoing training;
- Teacher/student ratio of no more than 1:10 with a maximum class size of 20 for 4-year-olds and lower ratios and smaller class sizes for younger children;
- Strong parent involvement; and
- Ongoing assessment of the program to ensure it is meeting its stated goals and objectives and is accountable to the children and families served (Epstein, 1985; Schweinhart, 1987; Bredekamp, 1987).

NAEYC also recommends that ECE programs not deny access to children based on screening or other arbitrary determination of children's readiness. High/Scope indicates that its recommended components are especially necessary for children who are poor or at risk of academic failure. Since the focus of this study was on preschool programs for at-risk children, the researcher utilized "eligibility" as an additional component in the analysis.

The analysis of the states' polices and legislation revealed that while all of the states appeared to acknowledge the research and recommendations of both High/Scope and NAEYC, each state reflected the High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations to varying degrees.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice

All seven states (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) either specifically mention developmentally appropriate practice or imply that such practice should be used in their preschool programs.

Illinois requires educational components to be based on sound theories of child development. Indiana recommends the use of a validated, developmentally appropriate curriculum model and even refers to the one recommended by NAEYC. Iowa's legislation for the Child Development Grants Programs mandates a developmentally appropriate ECE curriculum, and one of Michigan's nine Standards specifically outlines developmentally appropriate practices.

The rules promulgated by the Ohio Department of Education for ECE programs require written policies and procedures regarding developmentally appropriate curriculum. Both Minnesota and Wisconsin imply that such practices be utilized.

Staff Training and Supervision

Training in ECE or child development is required in Illinois and Michigan, while Iowa requires training or experience in ECE or child development. New teacher certification standards for teachers of preschoolers went into effec in Illinois in 1988, in Minnesota in 1989, and will go into effect in Wisconsin in 1992, and in Michigan and Ohio in 1993. Indiana does not require training in ECE or child development for teachers who teach preschoolers.

Inservice training for staff in preschool programs is required in Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio, and recommended in Indiana. Inservice education opportunities are available statewide in Minnesota. Neither ongoing training nor staff development is specifically stipulated in legislation, rules, guidelines, or requirements in Illinois or Wisconsin.

Illinois utilizes ECE consultants to provide technical assistance to the preschool programs. Only Michigan and Ohio require administrators who supervise the programs to have training in ECE or child development.

Teacher/Student Ratio

Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan require a maximum teacher/student ratio of 1:10 for 4-year-olds which is commensurate with High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations. Ohio's teacher/student ratio is greater: 1:14, while Iowa's is smaller: 1:8. Neither Minnesota nor Wisconsin stipulate teacher/student ratio in their educational preschool programs, although Wisconsin requires a maximum ratio of 1:12 for the Milwaukee day-care programs.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement refers to services provided to parents so that they can more effectively support their children and develop themselves as parents. All seven states either require or recommend parent involvement.

Legislation in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and the legislation that created the Wisconsin P-5 Program mandates parent involvement. Indiana's guidelines suggest collaboration between parents and teaching staff. Specific requirements for parent involvement are specified in one of Michigan's nine Standards. The Ohio Department of Education promulgated rules that provide for a written plan to encourage parent involvement and participation and to keep parents informed about the ECE program and its services.

The Wisconsin 4-year-old kindergarten does not have a specific requirement for parent involvement, although it is encouraged by the Department of Public Instruction.

Assessment

Both High/Scope and NAEYC recommend ongoing evaluation or assessment of the ECE program to ensure that it is meeting its stated goals and objectives. Further, they contend that assessment should go beyond fiscal monitoring and address accountability to the children and families served.

All seven states have some type of accountability built into their programs. Beginning July 1, 1989, the ISBE must report the results and progress of students enrolled in the preschool programs to the Illinois General Assembly every three years. Further, ISBE must report which programs have been most successful in promoting excellence and alleviating academic failure. Procedures for collecting longitudinal data regarding academic progress of all students enrolled in the preschool programs have also been developed in Illinois. ISBE also requires written goals, objectives, and timelines for completion, as well as individual assessment profiles and progress plans.

The administrative guidelines prepared by the Indiana Department of Education to implement the Education Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students specifies that program evaluation must be tied to the objectives of the program.

Iowa's Child Development Grants Program stipulates that grant recipients must provide ongoing monitoring and evaluation of program goals. Michigan's preschool programs must establish goals and objectives, and administrators and supervisors must evaluate the programs.

Advisory councils must be appointed by local boards of education that have ECFE programs in Minnesota. These councils are required to assist the school boards in monitoring the programs. The Minnesota Department of Education also adopted rules regarding annual reporting procedures for the ECFE programs.

Likewise, the Ohio Department of Education developed procedures for evaluating and monitoring the preschool programs as part of its rules promulgated under the Revised School Code.

No formal assessment requirements were stipulated for the Wisconsin 4-year-old kindergarten; however, annual testing in grades preschool through grade 5 has been required since the 1987-88 school year in the P-5 Program to determine short- and long-term effects of the Program.

Eligibility

Eligibility refers to who has access to programs. High/Scope reports that quality preschool programs should be made available at least to children who are poor or otherwise at risk of academic failure. NAEYC contends that all children should have access to preschool programs, especially programs that are in public schools, regardless of their developmental levels.

Most of the SEA policies and legislation studied were created specifically for children at risk of academic failure; however, some states have provisions that allow for greater access.

Preschool programs in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa primarily serve 3- and 4-year-old at-risk children. The local education agencies in Illinois and Indiana must define their own criteria for eligibility.

Michigan and Wisconsin identify specific programs for 4-year-olds. And the Minnesota ECFE Program and the Ohio preschool programs are open to all young children, birth to kindergarten enrollment age.

While Michigan's program is specifically for 4-year-olds, the Michigan Standards appear to go the farthest in carrying out High/Scope and NAEYC recommendations. The Standards specify that programs cannot exclude or limit participation on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, handicapping condition, or socioeconomic status. Further, the Standards stipulate that support services must be provided to meet the needs of the population served.

Policy Implications

Initiatives exist in each of the seven states to provide early intervention services to academically at-risk young children. As state and local decisionmakers continue to propose, implement, and expand services for young children, they may need to consider the implications of their state policies.

Major policy implications presented in the study relate to the following areas: 1) **quality (staff qualifications, recruitment and retention of teachers, facilities, articulation between early childhood levels, and parent involvement)**; 2) **delivery and coordination of services**; and 3) **accountability**.

Quality

Although legislative activity in the past has focused primarily on the allocation of fiscal resources, it is more and more common today to find policies and mandates relating to the curriculum content, how that content is taught, and by whom. All seven states in the study either mandate or recommend that teaching practices and curriculum be developmentally appropriate in order to ensure quality.

NAEYC recommends three major policies to achieve developmentally appropriate early childhood programs: 1) ECE teachers must have college-level specialized preparation in ECE or child development and be supported and encouraged to obtain and maintain current knowledge; 2) ECE teachers must have practical, supervised experience teaching young children prior to being in charge of a group; and 3) teacher/child ratios must be appropriate for the ages of the children, and class size must be limited (Bredekamp, 1987).

Staff Qualifications

All of the states except Indiana currently require, or will require within the next few years, that teachers be trained or experienced in ECE or child development. This does not mean that six of the seven states require a baccalaureate degree with a major in ECE or child development. Some states permit persons with a CDA (Child Development Associate) credential or associate degree in ECE or child development to teach in a preschool program, while others permit those licensed as day-care center supervisors to teach in the preschool program. Teacher preparation also varies considerably across the states. As states develop new teacher licensure requirements or increase the requirements necessary for persons to teach in a preschool program, teacher preparation programs will have to be developed and/or expanded in colleges and universities. Further, approved practice teaching sites will need to be found.

Recruitment and Retention of Teachers

State policy has additional implications for teacher recruitment and retention. If states continue to permit underqualified persons to teach preschool programs -- and pay them the same low salaries that child-care workers earn -- they may not only produce a negative impact on program quality, but also have difficulty in staffing the programs.

Unless preschool teachers are paid salaries and benefits commensurate with that provided to teachers of older children, the policies, mandates, and desires to provide preschool programs will be meaningless if no one wants to teach in them. At present, Michigan is the only North Central state that requires that preschool staff receive salaries, wages, and benefits commensurate with other K-12 district staff who have similar assignments and responsibilities and who are employed under the same contract.

Facilities

The location of preschool programs is another implication of state policy. NAEYC recommends a minimum of 35 square feet of usable indoor floor space per child for play, and a minimum of 75 square feet per child of secured outdoor space. The environment, both inside and outdoors, should be clean, safe, spacious, and attractive. Finding such space can be problematic in many areas. Many inner-city school buildings, such as those in Milwaukee and Chicago, already are overcrowded and in need of repair. Some suburban communities have sold, leased, or razed school buildings because of sharp enrollment declines. And in a number of states, many school buildings fall below current expectations for safe and healthful facilities. Policymakers may have to consider sites other than public school buildings for state-funded preschool programs.

Articulation Between Early Childhood Levels

ECE generally is considered to include children from birth to age 9. Although all states believe that programs for young children should be developmentally appropriate, four states (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio) found through the work of study groups, task forces, and commissions that many existing programs -- particularly in kindergarten through grade 3 -- place too much emphasis on early academics. Kindergarten and primary teachers and administrators need to examine curriculum, instruction, and assessment to determine whether or not all three are aligned and reflect the development of young children.

Parent Involvement

All seven states require or recommend parent involvement to enhance children's development and parents' parenting skills. However, service providers will have to be careful in the design and development of their policies and procedures so that good intentions are not seen as an invasion of parents' privacy and a usurpation of their rights as primary caregivers to their children. Confidentiality and ethics are two areas local service providers may want to consider for staff development training.

Delivery and Coordination of Services

The types of services provided, methods, and staff involved are additional implications of the states' policies. Will preschool programs be center-based or home-based? Will such services be educational only, or will they include health, social, nutrition, and day-care services as well? Iowa and Minnesota recommend comprehensive services to young children (as do NAEYC, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education), and it is obvious that interagency cooperation will be necessary to implement comprehensive services. Relationships between agency administrators will have to be developed, and mechanisms for service delivery and financing services will have to be established. LEAs will have to work in cooperation with other agencies, and they may want to consider establishing cooperation with existing school programs sponsored through Chapter I, bilingual, and the Education for the Handicapped Amendments of 1986.

Accountability

All seven states have built accountability into their programs. The quality of program evaluations and the strategies used to communicate evaluative information to policymakers may significantly influence the amount of funds state legislatures appropriate for these programs either to maintain or expand services. Thus, it may behoove both SEAs and LEAs to require and provide training in program evaluation. Quality program evaluation could prove to be the factor that determines whether policymakers view early intervention as a passing fad or make a long-term commitment to its institutionalization within the educational system.

*****

This policy study attempted to shed some light on the status and implications of policies and programs aimed at altering the trend of academic failure for young children in the North Central Region. The development of state policy is contextual. What works in one state may not be what's best in another. Each state has different needs, different resources, and strong forces that compete for any monetary resources.

It is clear that states in the North Central Region value young children. Due to the collective efforts of policymakers, educators, parents, and other citizens, thousands of young children have been given the opportunity to improve their chances to succeed in school and life.

This is the place to start, for that is where the children are. For only a hard look at the world in which they live -- a world we adults have created for them in large part by default -- can convince us of the urgency of their plight and the consequences of our inaction. Then perhaps it will come to pass that, in the words of Isaiah, 'A little child shall lead them' (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, p. 165).

*****

The complete study, Early Intervention for At-Risk Children in the North Central Region: A Comparative Analysis of Selected State Education Agencies' Policies (Kunesh, 1990) and a companion document, A Historical Review of Early Intervention (Kunesh, 1990), can be obtained from:

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue
Elmhurst, IL 60126
(708) 941-7677

Order # ECE-901; $10.00 (Early Intervention) and
ECE-903; $ 4.00 (A Historical Review)

Bibliography

Barnett, W. S. (1985). The Perry Preschool Program and its long-term effects: A benefit-cost analysis. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Berrueta-Clement, J. R., Schweinhart, L. J., Barnett, W. S., Epstein, A. S., & Weikart, D. P. (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.). (1987). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). Two worlds of childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Children's Defense Fund. (1987). Childcare: The time is now. Washington, DC: Author.

Committee for Economic Development. (1987). Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged. New York: Author, Research and Policy Committee.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1987). Elements of a mode! state statute to provide educational entitlements for at-risk students. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1988). Early childhood and family education. Washington, DC: Author.

Epstein, A. S. (1985). Overview. In L. J. Schweinhart & D. P. Weikart (Eds.). Quality in early childhood programs: Four perspectives. (High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, No. 3). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Gnezda, T., & Sonnier, C. (1988). Early childhood education: The status of state involvement (State Legislative Report, Vol. 13, No. 16). Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Grub, W. N. (1987). Young children face the states: Issues and options for early childhood programs. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education -- kindergaraten through graduate school. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Moynihan, D. P. (1986). Family and nation. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1988). Right from the start, the report of the NASBE task force on early childhood education. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Conference of State Legislatures. (1989). Educational improvements emerge as priorities for '89. State Legislatures, 15, (2) 6.

National Governors' Association (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: Author, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

National Governors' Association (1987). The first sixty months. Washington, DC: Author, Committee on Human Resources and Center for Policy Research.

Schweinhart, L. J. (1985). The preschool challenge. (High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, No. 4). Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation.